DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 534 CE 015 049

AUTHOR	Pucinski, Roman
TITLE	The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education. Occasional Paper No. 36.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE	Feb 78
NOTE	18p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for Research in Vocational Education Publications, Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($1.90)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Citizen Participation; Citizen Role; Community Cooperation; Community Involvement; Community Organizations; Community Planning; Community Role; Cooperative Planning; *Educational Development; Educational Innovation; Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; Federal Legislation; Federal Regulation; Federal State Relationship; Futures (of Society); Human Resources; Labor Supply; Manpower Development; Manpower Needs; Relevance (Education); Research Needs; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	United States; *Vocational Education Amendments 1968

ABSTRACT

The state and local vocational education advisory councils, created by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, provide citizen input into the development and planning of vocational education programs. The whole structure of American industry is undergoing enormous change. We look to vocational education to help prepare this nation for expanded economic growth and to meet the increased needs for human resources. The six pillars of American education to consider when structuring the future system of vocational education are career education, vocational education, postsecondary education, adult education, special education for the handicapped and disadvantaged, and special education for the gifted. Now how do we get all this put together? By law we have created the state advisory councils. They have a full role to play in developing a state plan; evaluating vocational programs, services, and activities; identifying state vocational education employment and training needs; and providing technical assistance to local advisory councils. The 1976 Amendments recognized the importance of research in vocational education and pull together the state and local advisory councils, state education board, manpower people, research establishment, and others to build an educational system that will meet the needs of the twenty-first century. (The author's answers to eight questions asked by the audience of vocational education research and development staff are attached.) (EM)

ED151534

Occasional Paper No. 36

THE ROLE OF STATE AND LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by

Roman Pucinski
Alderman, City of Chicago

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

February 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OE 015049

THE NATIONAL CENTEP MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

PREFACE

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education is indebted to Mr. Roman Pucinski for his lecture entitled, "The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education."

Mr. Pucinski, currently Alderman in the city of Chicago and a member of the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, discussed the roles and responsibilities of state and local advisory councils of vocational education. He also discussed the need for vocational education to work closely with Manpower and CETA programs. Considerable attention was given to the new legislation and its requirements for local advisory councils.

Born on May 13, 1919, Mr. Pucinski was raised in Chicago where he attended Wells High School. He later attended Northwestern University and John Marshall Law School.

During his fourteen years in Congress, Mr. Pucinski served on the Veteran's Affairs, and Education and Labor Committees. In 1965, he was appointed Chairman of the Select Subcommittee on General Education. During his work with that committee, he wrote and sponsored major education legislation, such as the School Lunch Act, the Adult Education Act, the Higher Education Act Amendments, the Tax Deduction for Education Expenses Act, the Children with Learning Disabilities Act, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and the Elementary and Secondary Act (Title I).

In addition to his work experiences, he served in the Army Air Corps during World War II. Mr. Pucinski was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for repeated acts of bravery. On his return to Chicago, he worked for the *Chicago Sun Times* as a reporter for twenty years.

Mr. Pucinski, in addition to his work in the field of education, wrote a record of support for Civil Rights, labor legislation, veteran's matters, social security/senior citizen legislation, environmental legislation, and a wide variety of other concerns.

On behalf of the National Center and the Ohio State University, I take pleasure in presenting Mr. Roman Pucinski's lecture, "The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education."

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director

THE ROLE OF STATE AND LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Next year we will observe the tenth anniversary of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and the state advisory councils. Much has happened in these ten years because of the leadership that state advisory councils, local advisory councils, and the national council have provided. When we wrote the 1968 Amendments we created the concept of state advisory councils because we felt, frankly and honestly, that just as politics is too important to leave to the politicians, education is too important to leave exclusively to the educators. We wanted to have some citizen input into the whole development and planning of our vocational education program. The state advisory councils have made a very significant contribution. We are hopeful that they have overcome their growing pains, and that we now can look to some strong leadership in some very difficult areas.

This nation is about to reach a $2 trillion economy. We are now generating 40 percent of the world's total gross national product even though we have only 6 percent of the world's population. The whole structure of American industry is undergoing enormous changes. We look to vocational education as one element to help prepare this nation for this enormous economic growth. I think it will become apparent very quickly that with the challenge which lies ahead for vocational education, we all can conclude vocational education is no sport for the meek. It will take a great deal of daring and many new concepts to meet changing conditions. That is not to say that there is anything dramatically wrong with vocational education now. I am not one who has bemoaned the plight of vocational education. As a matter of fact, I believe that on this tenth anniversary of the advisory councils and the 1968 Amendments, we have done reasonably well. One could argue very effectively that we have done better in this past decade on vocational education than we have done in many other aspects of the educational spectrum.

Vocational educators have been alert to the changing needs of American education. We have changed the basic Vocational Education Act a number of times—in 1963, '68, '70, '73, and '76, the most recent changes. We have built throughout America a very exciting network of area vocational centers. I submit that if there were something wrong with vocational education, then the richest county in America—DuPage County just outside of Chicago—would not have spent $9.5 million of its own money to build one of the most elaborate area vocational centers in the country, if not the world. We have also built a very exciting network of community colleges which are preparing young people and old people for the world of work. A large segment of the community college population is adults who are continuing their education or retraining.

Today, 13 million Americans are engaged in vocational education and I submit that's not a bad record. We have also increased expenditures. In 1952, only $286 million was spent in this country on vocational education; today $4.5 billion is being spent on vocational education. We must be doing something right. Those that would have you believe that vocational education needs to undergo radical, dramatic changes are not quite in touch with reality. Sometimes we tend to place too many expectations on vocational education. We demand more from vocational education than we do from any other segment. For instance, we have 46,000 young Americans enrolled in

journalism schools in this country. There's no way in the world that all 46,000 of these young people are going to be hired as future Bernsteins or Woodwards. They're not going to be hired as reporters. There just aren't that many jobs. Nobody has ever suggested that we shut down the journalism schools or that we put some sort of restrictions or limitations on student loans, scholarships, or other programs because all of these journalism graduates won't get jobs.

Yet, in vocational education we have to prove that for every single course we offer, there is a job need. It is not fair to make such rigid demands on vocational education.

I suggest that one of the great shortcomings of our program is what I call "vocational education parochialism." You have to first ascertain the job needs of the community. Then you develop an educational program that will fill those job needs. These indigenous job needs place severe restraints on vocational education in each community. We totally ignore the fact that Americans are the most mobile people in the world. One out of five families in this country moves every year. I recently did a study of the 100 top executives of *Fortune* magazine's 500 top corporations and found that not one of those top executives reached his or her success in the community where he or she was born or went to school. It seems to me that, with the help of state advisory councils, we can develop vocational education programs that will serve the needs of the human being, the individual's own aptitudes and desires, instead of restructuring the individual to the limited needs of the community in which he or she lives. Why shouldn't people have a greater voice in what they want to do with their lives? We should provide vocational education programs geared to the aptitudes of individuals in a community with less regard to whether or not there is a job. To do that, we will need more help from the federal government for vocational education—a sort of Title I for vocational education—because the local school boards will not finance that kind of a program. They're not going to train young people in one community to take jobs in another community. They're going to say if Chicago needs tailors, let Chicago train them. We need federal assistance because mobility of American families is a federal right. The right to move from one community to another is the keystone of the American democratic process. As long as people exercise a federal right, the federal government ought to provide financial assistance to develop meaningful programs for those people. These are the kind of things we hope state advisory councils will deal with.

The 1976 Amendments mandate that state advisory councils work more closely with the CETA program and with the Manpower program so that we can have better dovetailing in developing programs which are meaningful and helpful. The bill has several provisions requiring development of a five-year plan and a one-year plan with close work and cooperation with the Manpower people in the community.

I like to think of vocational education and the work of the advisory councils as the moving force to meet what will be our greatest shortage in America very shortly. We all admit there will be an energy shortage, but as this country plunges to a $2 trillion economy, a $4 trillion by 1990, a $7 trillion by the year 2000, our biggest shortage will be "human resources." That's why I feel so bullish about the future of vocational education. I believe that's the only way we can go, if we are to satisfy the needs of this enormous economic growth. We already have had some experience with labor shortages; we had a curtain raiser during the decade of the '60s, when we drafted half a million American youngsters and sent them to Viet Nam. We had ten years of uninterrupted economic growth in the decade of the '60s, and we had an unemployment rate of 2.3 percent in this country. We witnessed then what ten years of uninterrupted economic growth means to America in terms of human shortages. If you recall, employers were raiding each other—stealing key employees, stealing executives, offering workers all sorts of incentives, such as paid vacations for their wives, and all sorts of other goodies to get them to work. It was sort of jungle law in the market place to attract competent people because industry needed them.

We were totally unprepared for such a sustained period of economic expansion, and we should learn something from that experience.

I would hate to see the epitaph on America's tombstone read "Success Destroyed America." That's why it's important for us to expand our vocational education system which is now serving 13 million young Americans. What we really have to do is look at the future needs and then structure a system of vocational education which will meet those needs.

I view American education as having six pillars:

- Pillar number one is career education. That's the exploration process—the preparation; developing awareness of the world of work; making young Americans aware of the fact that sooner or later they're all going to be working; helping them choose a career.

- The second pillar is vocational education. That's the delivery system. I can't think of anything more cruel that we can do as Americans than to whet the appetites of young people for careers or professions and then not provide a vocational education delivery system to fulfill those dreams and desires. There's no competition between career education and vocational education; they complement each other. As career education becomes more successful in the exploration process, from early childhood to retirement, vocational education will grow to provide the delivery system at the secondary level.

- The third pillar is postsecondary education—the community colleges and universities and all of those institutions with potential for developing advanced studies in the trades, careers, and professions.

- The fourth pillar is adult education. We're now estimating that the average American will change job skills from five to nine times in a working lifetime. We're talking about changing jobs; we change jobs frequently, but with this fast, vastly developing economy—$2 trillion, $4 trillion, and $7 trillion—we're going to find entire new concepts and new skills in the structure of production. To prepare for these new skills, Americans will be attending school almost all of their lives right up until retirement and even after retirement. So adult education becomes a keystone. I envision the day when our schools will be open almost twenty-four hours a day because those people who work during the day will be going to school at night, and those who work the swing shift, will be going to school after midnight.

- The fifth pillar is the handicapped and disadvantaged. As we move into this enormous economic growth, we will no longer be able to discriminate against the handicapped. The big push now is on the handicapped. It's not only morally wrong to deal them out of the benefits of our economic system, but it is now legally wrong. More importantly, industry will need them.

- Finally, the sixth pillar is the gifted. We sometimes get ourselves so absorbed in thinking about the less fortunate that we forget the gifted. Why shouldn't there be a strong, effective vocational education program for the gifted? They, too, need skills; they, too, need jobs. There's a tendency, and there has been for the last fifty years, to look upon the gifted as going into the academic track—to move them on to higher education simply because they're gifted. But we need gifted people in almost every job classification as our entire system becomes more and more sophisticated. We need gifted people in very many of the trades and skills. Where is it written that a truck driver shouldn't enjoy Brahms as much as anyone else? Equally important is the fact that more and more of our literati can't find jobs because they are "over-qualified."

Now how do we get all this put together? That's why we created state advisory councils. We have provided by law that state advisory councils are to be advisors and independent evaluators of educational needs. Our greatest problem with state advisory councils is impressing upon them the role they play in the scheme of things because they're citizens. Very frequently they're awed by the academic world or by the political world. We try to impress upon these councils that their job is to bring citizen input into the development of programs and to make them effective. Through advisory councils the views and perspectives of labor, business, and the general public are made a part of the educational development process. We have tried to put into these advisory councils, a broad cross-section of the community. We have provided that every state that wants to participate in federal funding of vocational programs, must establish a state advisory council. We have provided that the state advisory council must fully participate in a development of the state plan. We have further provided that a state advisory council must certify that indeed it has participated in the development of a state plan from beginning to end, because we don't want a group of citizens put together in a state advisory council and then put out in left field to be consulted only on the finished product. They have to play a full role in every step in the development of a state plan. If they don't play that role, they don't certify the plan, and funds are held up. In two instances the Office of Education has indeed held up funds because the state advisory council felt that it was not sufficiently involved in the planning process.

We had a tough time persuading state boards and state superintendents to accept the state advisory council as a full partner in this development process. But Congress has consistently redefined and strengthened the role of the advisory councils to the effect that they have been made financially independent. When we started out with this concept of state councils, the state board or the state superintendent would name the fiscal agent and by controlling the purse string of a state council, they were able to control the council itself. Now we've taken that away from the state director. The state advisory council now selects the fiscal agent, and its money goes through that fiscal agent. We also changed the law to give advisory council members determinate terms. When we first established the state advisory councils, the governor would appoint the members or if there was an elected school board, the school board would appoint them to serve at the pleasure of the appointing body. If a member of a state advisory council began to ask too many questions or insist on too many points, he or she would just be conveniently dropped. In one state, a new governor, came in and didn't like the old board so he threw the whole group out. We've changed the law now; state advisory members are appointed to a determinant term of three years. The state advisory council, broadly represented, cannot have members of the state board of education, or the chief school officer on the advisory council. They meet with them and they work with them but they can't sit on the council itself. The state advisory councils also have an executive director. These state advisory councils are more than just a group of citizens who get together and have tea once a year. Congress really wanted their input so it defined what kind of people shall be on the board—businesspersons, labor leaders, etc. As a matter of fact, because Congress wanted broadly based citizen's input, the law now requires that a majority of the members of the state advisory council cannot be and must not be educators. Educators can be on the council but they cannot be in the majority. It's not that we don't trust the educators; it's just that we felt educators have other resources to get their message across.

Some of the duties of the state advisory councils are to make all physical and business arrangements for meetings, prepare agenda for the council, prepare minutes, arrange for continued flow of reports to council members, data, statistics, and other information available from federal, state, and local agencies and organizations that may be pertinent to the deliberation of the advisory council, work with various committees, prepare and submit all documents and reports required by state agencies. They worked with the governor; they worked with the school board; they work

with everybody; they work with Congress. One of the things that we want the state advisory council to do is to work very closely with their congressmen, their state legislature, and with the National Advisory Council. But the checklist of the state advisory council perhaps gives you the story as best as I can do it. First of all they advise the state board on the development of the five-year state plan, the annual plan, and accountability report. The new '76 act adds another layer of responsibility and that is accountability for the programs. They evaluate vocational programs, services and activities assisted under the act, and publish and distribute the results thereof. They prepare and submit to the commissioner and the National Advisory Council an annual evaluation report. They identify, after consultation with the state manpower services council, the vocational education employment and training needs of the state and assess the extent to which vocational education, employment training, vocational rehabilitation, special education, and other programs assisted under this and related acts represent a consistent integrated and coordinated approach to meeting such needs. They provide technical assistance, as requested, to local advisory councils and recipients of Public Law 94-482, funds in establishing and operation of local advisory councils. The new law now requires that local communities getting federal vocational money must have a local advisory council which performs about the same duties as the state advisory council; hold at least one public meeting each year to give the public a chance to express views concerning funds, concerning vocational education programs in the community and the state; prepare and submit a budget to the U.S. Commissioner for approval; and prepare and submit a financial statement to the U.S. Commissioner.

The Congress was very anxious to make sure that these state advisory councils retain their independence. In the last ten years we have had difficulty in defining the role of state advisory councils. Once we have overcome that problem, we then begin having problems with educators, state boards, state directors, who say advisory councils can give us advice but can't "fool around with the plumbing." Congress has been very impatient that the states have not given the state advisory councils the kind of independence it intended. It was felt the councils could not make independent evaluations and recommendations if they were subject to control or undue influence by the administrators of the programs being evaluated. Over the years this concern has generated a number of congressional statements, changes, and regulations that emphasize congressional intent for independent councils, culminating with the latest 1976 Amendments designed to statutorially strengthen the independence of the councils. The issue was first addressed in a Senate report on January 21, 1970. As you know, the Senate report and the House report give you the intent of the legislative body and they're very important. They really take on the color of law in legal proceedings where there is some question as to what Congress intended with certain legislation. The courts frequently look not only to the debate but to the committee report for some guidance. The Senate said,

> The committee believes these councils shall be independent evaluators of the effectiveness of programs within the states and independent commentators on the advisability of the provisions of the state plans. This independence, especially from the state departments of education, is essential if the councils are to make sound, objective judgments. Therefore the committee is very concerned about the presence of state directors of vocational education on several councils and the use of state department personnel by other councils seriously erode the effectiveness of those councils. The committee accordingly urges the Office of Education to review the operation of all the state councils, to require that state directors be excluded from membership and that funds appropriated for the councils go directly to the councils from the Office of Education to be used at the sole disgression of the council for the employment of staff and free evaluation of studies.

The federal regulations were suddenly changed to read, "The membership of the state advisory council shall exclude members of the state board, the state director of vocational education, and the state board staff."

The report of the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1971 again addressed the matter of advisory councils. The committee said lastly,

> The committee wants to emphasize again its intent that the state advisory councils of vocational education are to be independent to state boards of vocational education. This independence is absolutely essential. The council ought to provide the state boards and the federal government with objective judgments and recommendations concerning the vocational programs within the states.

Therefore, the Office of Education is directed by the committee to assure that each state council receive and use its operating funds provided by the amendments without obstruction from the state boards of vocational education. And again the Office of Education explained the revision of a letter of December of 1971 in which the Office of Education said, "The purpose of the revision was to ensure greater independence and autonomy on the part of the council enabling it to handle its own fiscal as well as other affairs." We've had a constant struggle with states in their trying to get around in every possible way this insistence by the Congress that the state advisory councils be independent in their judgment.

So in 1973 we went at it again and said,

> We strongly believe that independent lay advisory councils at both the national and state levels infusing the views and perspectives of business, labor, and the general public into the educational process are especially important in the area of vocational education. They provide advice to both the educational administrators and to Congress which cannot be phrased by professional educators.

What the Congress meant here was that every year the state advisory council submits to us a report on the status of vocational education in that state. It also gives us now an evaluation report. The Congress said further, "The national and state advisory councils of vocational education are an integral part of the Vocational Education Amendemtns of 1968." States which do not have councils are ineligible for funds under the act. So we went on and on trying to establish the independence.

Congress was so insistent because we view vocational education indeed as a keystone for survival of the future, so we want this new input. Now you as educators might say, "That's fine," but it was Aristotle who 2,400 years ago said that democracy is a perversion of constitutional government, so when you let a lot of citizens tell you what to do in education you're running into trouble. It's that impatience with citizen input that we try to overcome in these various changes and amendments of the last ten years to make these councils respected as a member of the development team of vocational education for that state and for that community.

I hope that I've been able to impress upon you the importance of these state advisory councils. These advisory councils are going to play a key role in the development of research programs. You are, to a great extent, a research institution. As you well know, in the new act that has now been approved by the Congress, Congress recognized the importance of research in vocational education, particularly as we see the emergence of the new technological needs of this enormously growing economy of ours and the world's. Congress has spelled out, first of all, that it is almost mandatory for every state now to have a research coordinating unit simply because most of the contracts now

for curriculum development, and for the various other aspects of research are going to have to be approved by the research coordinating unit. I think it's important to give you some idea of where the research institution fits into the new concepts of vocational education as spelled out in the 1976 Amendments. It says here in Section 130,

> From the sums made available for grants in this subpart pursuant to section 103. The commissioner is authorized to make grants to states to assist them in improving their vocational education program and in providing supportive services for such programs in accordance with the provisions of this act. Grants to states in this subpart may be used in accordance with the five-year state plan and annual program as approved by the state pursuant to Section 1 for the following purposes: research programs, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development programs, provisions of guidance and counseling services, provisions of preservice/inservice training, grants to overcome sex bias.

You will find that one of the great challenges to the research community in pursuing the 1976 Amendments- and you will find this throughout the whole act—is the growing concern to eliminate sex bias in vocational education and in the development of skills and trades. Here the research community will have to give us considerably more ideas and suggestions on how to deal with this problem. There, of course, are improved curriculum materials for presently funded programs in vocational education and new curriculum materials for new and emerging job fields including a review and revision of any curricula developed in this section to insure that such curricula do not reflect stereotypes based on sex, race, or national origin. Now this legislation will make funds available both for curriculum development and research.

The Office of Education has identified fifteen basic clusters which offer a rational approach to the development of meaningful vocational programs. They're now suggesting a sixteenth cluster to deal with the whole problem of energy. It's going to be within these basic clusters that we will see most of our good research developing in education. Funds are being made available for curriculum development and for research. In the new national research center, it is my hope that we will develop fully and improve the statistical capabilities that we now have. What we need to do, with the help of this research money, is to put together a better method of reporting our successes so that those who have been critical to vocational education will not fail to see the forest for the trees. There's no question that we've had some problems in vocational education. You for instance in the research community will have to set up and develop for us the criteria for testing the effectiveness of vocational education. There are those who, for instance, say why it is that so many young people who graduate from vocational schools do not enter that vocation when they go to work? The question is, what's a fair time period? Do you mean next Monday, do you mean next month, do you mean next year? It's not uncommon for young people to develop one skill and then for all sorts of reasons not be able to find that particular job and take temporary employment in some other job. But that is not a basis for indicting the whole vocational program. Sooner or later young people gravitate into work for which they were prepared. The statement was made here recently before this group that there's apparently some evidence that young people who graduate from vocational programs do not get a better paying job than youngsters who graduate from a normal high school program. I would like to see some research on that subject, and I'd like to see some statistics. I believe that young people who graduate from vocational schools get into a better paying job faster.

Furthermore, it's my judgment that without vocational education we could not train the kind of people that we will need. One example is the health professions field—the whole cluster of health professions. If Congress passes a national health insurance bill as we now suspect it will, there just

will not be enough doctors anywhere in this country to do the entire job. Those vocational establishments that offer health professions training courses for paramedics are going to impact very heavily for many years to come. The research community will have the most exciting challenge in working closely with the Manpower community, with the state advisory council, with the coordinating units, to develop,research. The act provides—and I don't think anybody will find any quarrel with this—that our research programs from now on must have some practical applicability to vocational education within five years, but that's not an unreasonable demand. I think that members of Congress did that merely to placate those who wanted to kill all research. I'm sure that the research community will be able to adapt to that without too much difficulty.

There's no question in my mind that educational programs will stagnate without a strong research and development component. I think that the evaluators have been somewhat cruel to the research community of vocational education. I think the research community of vocational education, the coordinating units, have done a pretty good job. Perhaps Congress is correct in saying that the material has been developed by the research community in vocational education, but has not been properly distributed. Maybe this is an area where perhaps the National Center and others can pave the way. The ERIC system in itself may not be sufficient to do the job. Maybe it is; I don't know. But if there is criticism that research is not being disseminated into the field, then let's deal with the delivery system. Let's not drown the baby with the dishwater.

The state/local advisory councils must make certain that funds and personnel are provided for research and development efforts, and this I am sure will be done. I hope that the economic community will start recognizing the fact that these state advisory councils are their friends; they are part of a system established by Congress to move the program forward as a team. The sooner the research community starts viewing the state advisory council as a partner in this search for a better educational system, the sooner we will be able to move forward. The councils can help make certain that at least part of the R&D effort is on a practical applied nature. Frankly, the councils help keep the researchers on their feet. This is not to downgrade basic research because basic research is necessary and has done a good job. But, here again, the state advisory council and the state director of the advisory council can be a great help.

As you can see I feel very bullish about the whole future of vocational education; I feel bullish about the provisions of the latest act—the 1976 act—which is now the frosting on the cake. I believe it's a good act. It was carefully put together. It provides the financial resources to build an educational system that will meet the needs of the twenty-first century, and we don't have much time left. I would hope that events will not overcome us. This is why the state advisory council, the local advisory council, the state education board, the state director, the executive director of the council, the Manpower people, the research establishment, universities—all of these now have been pulled together in one common effort.

Maybe there are those in Congress who don't appreciate the roles the universities and institutions of higher learning play in the development of our program in education. I think it's safe to say that, without the work and input of our universities, without the research that they have performed, I doubt very much if this country today would be reaching for a $2 trillion economy. We are unique as Americans; we are the youngest nation, the youngest major power in the world. We're only 200 years old. When you look at the histories of Russia, France, England, Germany, Poland, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, and all the other countries of the world, we're just a babe. Yet in those short 200 years we have achieved a plateau of economic development unprecedented in the history of civilization. I suggest to you that the passage of the Smith Hughes Act and our deep preoccupation with vocational education for the last fifty to sixty years has been an integral part of the enormous economic growth of America. I don't think that the vocational educators have anything to apologize for. I believe that we've done a pretty good job. I think, though, that in this room and in the entire vocational education community there are people who realize the need for additional growth in the wake of this incredible economic development that faces our country. So you can see your work is cut out for you, but we place great faith in the cornerstone of the American democracy and that is its people. Members of the state advisory councils are an impressive resource. I suggest that we make better use of them.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question. In your judgment, to what extent did Congress, in designing the new act, seek out and listen to both state advisory councils and the national advisory council in the legislation that ultimately resulted?

I'm the chairman of the Legislative Committee of the National Advisory Council, and I worked very closely with the Congress and the development of this act. Jack Jennings was my committee counsel when I was in Washington. The staff of the National Advisory Council—George Wolrott and Reginald Petty—worked very closely with the committee, both in the House and in the Senate. We have followed this legislation very carefully right through the appropriating process. I am pleased with the respect that Congress has given our recommendations. We had substantial input into this bill, and we of course got our instructions from the state advisory councils. We have at least once a year and, more often, joint meetings, joint sessions, between the National Advisory Council and the state advisory councils. At that time the state advisory councils through their members and their executive directors tell us the problems they are having at the state level. The redefinition of the fiscal agent came out of a debate by the state councils. We had a meeting. The state councils told us the problems they were having in controlling their finances and the lack of total independence because the state agency controlled their money. It was out of those discussions and out of that debate that we finally persuaded the Congress to let the state advisory council select its own fiscal agent for handling its finances.

There have been other changes that have been made back and forth in the last ten years, and the suggestions have come out of the state advisory councils. We also study our staff. We passed a new motion before the National Advisory Council that every member of the National Advisory Council will review at least two state plans and, hopefully, in some instances, three or four so that every state plan will have been reviewed by a member of the National Advisory Council. Then that input goes on to the Congress because NACVE's basic mission is to provide guidance and advice to the Congress. We testify before the Congress very frequently. We work with the Congress very closely. So the chain of command goes from the local council, to the state council, to the National Advisory Council, to the Congress and the Senate, to the House and the Senate, and to the Office of Education and finally, to the White House. For instance, we may get suggestions from the state advisory councils that don't need legislation and can be corrected administratively. We meet with the Commissioner of Education very frequently and pass on to the commissioner the problems, and those are frequently resolved through administrative directive. The cooperation between the state, the national council, the Congress, and the Office of Education is good. The relationship now is improving substantially between state advisory councils and the local school authorities. After ten years they are now starting to realize that the state advisory council is a very worthy partner in this search for excellence in education. The atmosphere today is much better than it was when we first started these advisory councils.

Question: In the President's new economic policy there are about thirteen or fourteen bills. Every one of those deals with the same group of people—people who have equal skills. My concern is that none of these speaks to education. They're all in DOL, in human resources, or CETA, which is part of DOL. How do you see this as affecting vocational education in the long run?

Perhaps I should have pointed out earlier to you that while we look with great encouragement to the fact that there are 13 million young Americans now enrolled in vocational education, we are not unmindful of the fact that youth unemployment is our single most serious problem in America today. At a National Advisory Council meeting we adopted as our main mission for the rest of this year a very careful analysis of the youth unemployment problem and development of suggestions to deal with it. But we've already moved on that, and I hasten to call your attention to the fact that in the Youth Employment Act which the President signed there is a provision that 22 percent of that money will be used for work study programs which will obviously be administered by the schools. The NACVE testified in support of this concept. We had also urged Congress to allocate more money for cooperative education so we could bring the industrial sector into the program.

I personally feel that every American high school senior should be involved in some work study program or cooperative education program because my experience has shown that young people who are engaged in a work formula during their high school senior year tend to mature much faster, to take their final year in high school much more seriously, to learn work habits which make the transition from school to work a good deal easier, etc., so we recommended a very heavy set-aside for cooperative education. We were not quite successful on that score but were very successful on our recommendations for work study. So the educational community is involved in the work study program. The educational community is also involved in other parts of youth employment and demonstration projects. My only problem with work study—the jobs that are related to the public sector—is that when that contract ends the young person frequently continues to be unemployed because the public agencies do not continue that slot. If we could move them through cooperative education into the private sector, our experience shows that very frequently an employer who hires a high school senior under the cooperative education program becomes very much attached to this young worker. The young worker develops the kind of skills that the employer wants and, in most instances, the employer finds some way to continue that job even after the youngster has left the cooperative education program. We will continue pressing for cooperative education, but the educational community is very heavily involved in the Youth Employment Act through the work study program.

Question: Would you expand on the idea of the National Advisory Council providing technical services to the state councils and the state councils to local councils? Is there much definition being developed on what this really means?

Yes. The National Advisory Council constantly is providing technical assistance to state advisory councils. The state advisory councils have a limited budget, so they cannot provide any financial assistance to local councils but they can provide technical assistance. In our meetings with the state directors, they tell us that they are indeed moving on to the local councils the information material necessary to make them more effective. Our biggest problem with the state advisory councils and local advisory councils, but mostly with the state advisory councils, is impressing upon them their independence because there's a tendency frequently by state advisory councils to be awed by the educational community and to feel that their input perhaps is not as effective. We have just now prepared a source book which is going to impress upon the state advisory councils

their responsibilities, their duties, how they structure the council. Each member of the council will know what's expected of him or her, and the technical assistance is now flowing. We have a staff at the National Advisory Council in Washington which works with others very closely. Our staff people meet with the state directors whenever the state directors meet, and any state director is free to contact the National Advisory Council anytime he/she wishes, anytime there's a question or a problem on the Hill. I think everyone will agree that our staff has been pretty efficient in that direction. There is a close relationship between the national council, the state councils, and the local councils. Someday some funds will probably be available for these local councils. Right now there aren't any that I know of.

Question. Who did the Congress intend to have appoint the local advisory council? Are the local advisory councils an extension of the advisory committee we had in the past? What is their function?

Let me just very quickly go through a very short passage and perhaps I can answer your question best on local councils.

> Each eligible recipient receiving assistance under this act to operate vocational education programs shall establish a local advisory council to provide such agency with advice on current job needs and on a relevancy of courses being offered by such agency in meeting such needs. Such local advisory council shall be composed of members of the general public, especially representatives of business, industry, and labor. Such local advisory councils may be established for program areas—schools, communities, or regions—whichever the recipient determines best to meet the needs of that recipient. Each state board shall notify eligible recipients within the state of the responsibility of such recipients under the provision of this paragraph. Each state advisory council shall make available to such recipients and the local advisory council of such recipients, such technical assistance as such recipients may request to establish and operate such councils.

So the eligible recipient—a school that is benefiting from federal vocational assistance, that I would presume would be the school principal or the chief school officer of that recipient, would appoint the local council.

Question: I question whether this present act is as positive or as directional in the future toward change as your previous act. In addition, there are no spokespersons for vocational education at the national level. My concern is for a greater voice at the national level by the national advisors in relationship to putting before the public, Congress, and the President the role that vocational education is playing and a plea for a greater role in working with the Appropriations Committee on funding in accordance with the requirements of the act.

Obviously, there's a fierce battle going on for the tax dollar in Washington. Washington like everything else is a game of priorities—where do you want to put your money? When you consider what's happening to a lot of other programs, the fact that we didn't go backward, that we got $25 million more than last year is some consolation. Obviously, we can always use more. The 1976 act tightens up programs. For instance, it requires that all research grants must now clear through the coordinating unit but you really can't quarrel too deeply with that. I think that's a sound assessment. The act does require that research has to be productive within five years; it

sets up a lot of other priorities; it tightens the program. But the act does not do any basic violence to the programs that we now have on the boards. I believe that in the last ten years there have been a number of changes since the 1968 Amendments, but they have all been an effort by Congress to make the education community more responsive. When you realize the intense battle that is now going on for dollars, and when you consider that the concern of the administration is obviously to put people to work as quickly as possible, that's why they put some of that money into youth employment and demonstration projects. They put some of this money into CETA. Now whether this is the best way to go I seriously question. If I were writing the 1976 Amendments I would prefer to go the cooperative education route. I would prefer to go the route of job placement through the vocational system. One of the things that we've had trouble in persuading Congress to accept is that you're dealing with human beings, not with machines that you can crank up. There's a high unemployment rate among young people because, basically, they're unprepared for gainful employment. The reasons for that are manifold, and we won't go into that now. It is not necessarily that there are jobs lacking; you pick up the *Chicago Tribune* on Sunday, and you see forty pages of want ads. Jobs are available, but they're not available for young people who are unskilled. This is why vocational education becomes so important.

We now estimate that by the end of this decade only 5 percent of the job opportunities in this country will be for unskilled help. Ninety-five percent of the job opportunities will need some form of job preparation. I will have to agree with you that perhaps I would have gone in a little different direction than this bill does. That's why we're going to be looking forward to the national research center to, among other things, develop a body of statistics which will then be able to help us project vocational education in a much truer perspective. I think there are many misconceptions, but I must tell you that I find as a source of great comfort the fact that vocational education gets unanimous support from both the House and the Senate. What we'll have to do is work a little harder on the Appropriations Committee. In the last twenty years we have gone through a number of quick solution projects to unemployment. We had the Manpower Development Act, the war on poverty, the OEO, the Job Corps, and the Youth Corps. They all seem to have come and gone. They have a very short existence. Vocational education always stays there. They look at these new, more exciting fast, quick solutions, find out they don't work, and then they go back to vocational education. Our job, yours and mine, and hopefully that of the new research center, and the state advisory councils, the national advisory council, is to impress upon Congress that you do not restructure human beings the way you overhaul a car. You can overhaul a piece of machinery, but one of the great problems we have is convincing the legislators that humans beings are different. You have to deal with them from many directions. Vocational education is one of those directions. I think that when we persuade Congress that that's the most reliable way to go, we will be finding more and more money for vocational education.

Question: Earlier you made comments about the fact that vocational education in your judgment has not needed radical changes, but that it still suffers from a type of parochialism. Could you elaborate on what you mean by that and also speak about what an agency like ours could do in terms of things not being done now to help overcome that type of parochialism?

When I said that vocational education doesn't need a major overhaul, it is because I think the facts are there. We have 13 million young people enrolled in vocational education. We have more teachers now transferring to vocational education. We changed the EPDA. I warned in 1968 that if we created EPDA the way they did there would be no money going to where it's needed in vocational education. It took me ten years to prove my point. So now we do have a reorientation of EPDA to

train teachers because more and more teachers want to get into vocational education. We now have more advanced degrees in vocational education. We no longer have to apologize to anyone for the quality of educational mechanism in vocational education. We are placing young people who are graduating from vocational education both at the secondary and postsecondary level. As a matter of fact, all of our postsecondary schools are oversubscribed. There are waiting lists in most of the country. Our vocational high schools are oversubscribed. The people perhaps have a lot more trust in vocational education than maybe some of the legislators, but that is not to say that we don't have to keep changing. I think it was Jefferson who said, "To refuse to accept change is to require a man to wear a coat that fit him as a boy." We are going to be a $2 trillion economy. We're going to have to have, for instance, new curriculum. When I say we need changes, we obviously are going to have to have new skills.

But the big change that I think will have to come will be to free vocational education from the so-called "indigenous need syndrome" on the theory that human beings move. When vocational education starts treating the individual as an individual instead of a statistic for community needs, that is when vocational education, and incidentally the whole American educational system, will take on its full meaning. For instance, we can teach young people to read, write, and reason with an auto mechanics manual just as easily as we can with the reading books they're now using, except that an auto mechanics manual might have much more interest for the student. I guarantee you he/she will learn to read much faster. The big change that will have to come is freeing vocational education from indigenous need constraints. Now local school boards will not spend that money, understandably. We will have a kind of Title I for vocational education where the federal government will exercise and recognize the role of the federal government in preparing people for the world of work wherever they grow up and wherever they settle, particularly in this enormous economic growth where industry is going to be looking for energy. We now have a big move. A lot of industries are leaving the big cities and moving to the sun belt. One of the big problems the sun belt is having is the inability to provide the kind of skilled workers that industry needs. So what's wrong with training young people in Chicago and if they then want to move down South, that's their business. We're a republic, and yet we watch our local dollars very jealously. What we have to have is a federal infusion recognizing that these people move in response to a federal constitutional right to move wherever they want.

Question: What can this National Center do to help people in local schools overcome that type of problem?

This center over the years has done some fantastic work but you would think it's a military secret. You do a good job; you try to get your material out there, but we're going to have to find some better way of distributing the kind of material about work you're already doing here. The Center can help mostly by addressing itself to some of the problems that I've discussed here today. For instance, The Center can help as one, in developing material for state advisory council members. We did it. We have a resource book and we're doing the best we can as a National Advisory Council. But it's entirely possible that you can establish a better relationship between state advisory council members and The Center so that you can free those people from the regiment of state superintendents. I don't say that with any criticism but you're talking about citizens, frequently not very highly versed in vocational education. Now they have a role. Congress has given them a role to play a part in developing the plans. This Center ought to tap into those members of the state advisory council. You ought to put them on your mailing list or something, so that you will give them a broader base and a larger perspective of what can be done with effective vocational education. They'll shake up their state superintendents and they'll shake up their school boards, but that's what Congress intended for the SACVE to do.

Question. Would you comment on the practicality and/or desirability of a merging of the Vocational Education Act and CETA and other relating pieces of federal legislation? Perhaps the Comprehensive National Resources Act?

The 1976 act mandates a closer cooperation, but I would not want to merge vocational education with CETA. The only thing that I would like to do is to transfer the United States Employment Service to vocational education so that vocational education would have a radar to be out there and see what's happening a little more effectively than we do now. The reason that I would oppose merging these programs at this time is, as I said a little while ago, programs like CETA are temporary programs. They're there and we've poured a lot of money, and we're going to see how they work. Now we're already finding problems. I have an awful lot of people who've been employed under the CETA programs whose contract has expired. Now the local government cannot pick up those jobs. The corporate funds just aren't there, so when that contract is terminated that person is right back on the unemployment rolls. As a matter of fact there'll be about a million young people going back on the unemployment rolls under the existing CETA program very shortly. That's why I would be opposed to merging these temporary efforts with what I consider to be a permanent ongoing program with a very bright future, the vocational education program.

I have no objection to working—as this 1976 act mandates us to do with CETA, with Manpower, with labor, with all these institutions and all these programs. We should be tapped into them. But as a long-range measure, looking into the twenty-first century, I believe the vocational education programs we built today will still be there when all these other temporary programs have fallen by the wayside simply because of their limited success. For that reason I would prefer to continue building our vocational education institutions as we have been for the last fifty years. I have a great deal more faith in their durability than I do in the temporary programs.